

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for performing a thorough search.

Claims 1 and 10 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 7-10, 13 and 16-18 are amended herein.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 11-12 and 14-15 are cancelled herein. No claims have been added.

Hence, Claims 1, 4, 7-10, 13 and 16-18 are pending in the Application. No new matter is added herein.

### I. IN THE SPECIFICATION

The Abstract is amended herein to correct an informality. Review and approval is respectfully requested.

### II. ISSUES RELATING TO OTHER THEN ALLEGED PRIOR ART

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 USC § 112 (¶ 2) because the claims are alleged to have no claimed result under a condition in which the particular combination is not a combination to which access is limited. Claims 2 and 11 are cancelled herein. Thus, their rejection under 35 USC § 112 (¶ 2) is moot.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis of this rejection. Nothing in the second paragraph of Section 112 precludes claiming a result of a particular condition. Applicant also finds no case law and nothing in the MPEP in general, nor particularly in § 2173 et seq. thereof, which demands, supports or sustains such an interpretation of the statute.

Moreover, independent Claims 1 and 10 are amended herein for reasons related to readability. As amended, Claims 1 and 10 and their respective dependent claims comply with 35 USC § 112. Reconsideration is requested.

### III. ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over published US Patent Application No. 2003/0014394 by Fujiwara, et al. (hereinafter Fujiwara) in view of US Patent No. 5,864,842 to Pederson, et al. (hereinafter Pederson). Claims 2 and 11 are cancelled herein. Thus, their rejection under the section is moot. With respect to the remaining claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended herein, Claim 1 reads as shown below.

1. A machine-implemented method for managing access to data, the method comprising the steps of:  
registering with a database server a policy function supplied by a user;  
said database server detecting that a database command requires access to columns in at least two tables; and  
in response to the step of detecting:  
said database server invoking of a policy to generate of a condition expression;  
and  
rewriting said database command by creating a modified database command to incorporate said condition expression, based on the database command.

Claim 10 is amended herein after a similar fashion.

Claims 1 and 10 recite that re-writing a database command is triggered in response to detecting that at least two columns from different tables being accessed. Triggering re-writing a database command responsive to detecting that at least two columns from different tables are being accessed, as claimed, differs from Fujiwara, in which only a single column is involved.

Claims 1 and 10 also recite that a query is modified with a database server. Modifying a query with a database server, as claimed, also differs from Fujiwara, in which queries are re-written before (e.g., in another part of a system from) a database server, database management system (DBMS), etc.

Further, Claims 1 and 10 recite that policy functions, which are user defined functions, return expressions that are incorporated into a query. User defined policy functions that return expressions, which are incorporated into a query, as claimed, further differs from Fujiwara, in which a user defined function returns a value for a column, which is in the results, and the output functions of Fujiwara are not incorporated in a query.

Pederson does not cure these defects of Fujiwara. Further still, triggering rewriting a database command responsive to detecting that at least two columns from different tables being accessed, as claimed, also differs from Pederson which, while perhaps descriptive in a sense of queries referencing multiple tables, fails to describe any sort of a detecting that triggers invocation of a function. Fujiwara does not cure this defect of Pederson. For at least these foregoing reasons, Claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the references, individually or combined, under 35 USC § 103(a). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

Application of WONG, D.MH.  
Serial No. 10/764,180  
Filed on Jan. 23, 2004

Examiner: NGUYEN, C.L.T.  
Group Art Unit No. 2172  
Confirmation No. 7861

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Lawrence R. Goerke  
Reg. No. 45,927

Dated: December 26, 2006

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext.206  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on 12/26/06 by Marlene Placid